

REMARKS

Claims 51-65 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, claims 51-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Flyntz (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,542) in view of Angelo (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,882). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Flyntz describes a smart card reader that grants or denies access to a restricted security subsystem based on identification information entered into the smart card reader by a computer user. See Flyntz, col. 2, ll. 52-57. Flyntz also describes the use of a microprocessor 32 that is separate from both the smart card reader and the smart card. See Flyntz, col. 15, ll. 5-49. However, as admitted by the Examiner, Flyntz does not describe or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a microcontroller included in a bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Applicant respectfully submits that Flyntz also fails to describe or suggest that the request is received from a bus external to the bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61.

Angelo describes a computer system that uses a password and an external encryption algorithm to allow access to secured computer resources. The computer system (S) described by Angelo includes a CPU/memory subsystem 100 that is connected to a PCI bus (P) by a PCI-ISA bridge 130. The CPU/memory subsystem 100 includes a microprocessor 102. See Angelo, col. 4, line 48-col. 5, line 4 and Figure 1.

As the Examiner well knows, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). As discussed above, and as admitted by the Examiner, Flyntz does not describe or suggest receiving a request for an authentication at a

microcontroller included in a bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Flyntz also fails to describe or suggest that the request is received from a bus external to the bridge, as set forth in independent claims 51, 56, and 61. Angelo fails to remedy the fundamental deficiencies of Flyntz, the Examiner's primary reference. In particular, the microprocessor 102 described by Angelo is located in the CPU/memory subsystem 100, which is coupled to the PCI bus by the PCI-ISA bridge 130. The microprocessor 102 depicted in Figure 1 and described by Angelo is therefore not included in the PCI-ISA bridge 130. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that even if the cited references were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the cited references would still fail to teach or suggest all the limitations set forth in the pending claims. A recent Federal Circuit case emphasizes that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 143 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Applicant submits that the Examiner has therefore fail to make a *prima facie* case that the present invention is obvious over the prior art of record and requests that the Examiner's rejections of claims 51-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2006

/Mark W. Sincell/

Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 52,226

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON

10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100

Houston, Texas 77042

(713) 934-7000

(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

AGENT FOR APPLICANT